

ADDRESS
of Union Electoral
Committee of N. Y.
1860.

LINCOLN LIBRARY
of

West Virginia
Wesleyan
College



In memory of
Charles Aubrey Jones, '04

Presented by
His Children

His

*While you converse
with lords and
dukes,
I have their betters
here—my books,
Fixed in an elbow-
chair at ease,
I choose compan-
ions as I please.*

—THOMAS SHERIDAN
TO DEAN SWIFT

Edward

S. Marsh

Book

UNION AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES.

262601

ADDRESS

OF THE UNION ELECTORAL COMMITTEE TO THE UNION MEN OF
NEW YORK.

THE undersigned, a Committee appointed by the Convention held at Utica on the 12th day of July last, with authority to form an Electoral Ticket, "in such manner as they deem best calculated to unite National Union men of every name and designation, and promote the election of John Bell and Edward Everett," having, according to their best judgment, discharged the trust confided to them, herewith report the result of their labors, together with the reasons on which the same is founded.

In doing this it will be convenient briefly to refer to the present divisions of parties and to the principles upon which such divisions are founded.

The issues that formerly divided parties seem to have become entirely obsolete. There is no longer any partisan controversy upon the subject of a national bank, internal improvements, the acquisition of territory, or a protective tariff. Some of these questions indeed survive, but they survive as differences between individuals, and no longer indicate the boundaries of parties. One only question, the question of slavery, agitates the American people, and lies at the foundation of all our party divisions. And even upon this subject the controversy is mainly restricted to a single phase of the question. It is universally admitted that there is no power in the General Government to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the States of the Union, whether to establish, or abolish, or regulate, or interfere with it in any manner whatsoever. Upon this whole subject the States, confessedly and beyond controversy, are sovereign. But the question that disturbs the harmony, and threatens the existence of the Union, is the less important one of slavery in those territorial possessions which are not yet sufficiently populous to be admitted as States into the Union, and over which Congress is vested with general legislative powers. What shall be the condition of those Territories, and who shall determine it? That is the question upon which the whole controversy hinges. And hence have arisen the sectional hatreds, the violence of mobs, the disruption of religious societies and of parties, and the schemes of disunion that threaten the existence of our fabric of Free Government. The opening of that question was, as has happily been said, the opening of Pandora's box; to close it, is to close the only serious controversy that disturbs the peace of the Union.

Upon this question, so fruitful of evil, we have no less than four parties, all of which propose different remedies and modes of settlement.

We have a Northern Sectional party, that demands that Congress shall prohibit slavery in all the Territories of the United States.

A Southern Sectional party, that demands that Congress shall uphold slavery in all the Territories of the United States.

A party that demands that Congress shall not interfere with slavery in the

Territories at all, but that the people of the Territories shall determine the question themselves.

And lastly, we have a party established for the very purpose of crushing agitation and restoring harmony, and which, in the mode by which it seeks to accomplish this object, differs materially from all the other parties. This Union party has laid down no platform, and established no test, other than are contained in the solemn declaration of its attachment to the Union, fidelity to the Constitution, and obedience to the laws. Platforms upon the subject of slavery are of modern origin, and experience shows that instead of settling disputes, their tendency is to engender and increase them. Our fathers tolerated, without attempting to smother or disguise, the natural and almost unavoidable differences that exist between Northern and Southern men upon this question. To that old and approved practice the Union party has returned.

It is easily seen from the above sketch of parties, that between the two first-named there is an irreconcilable difference; that they are indeed the opposites of each other; but that between the two others, namely, the National Democracy and the Union party that supports Bell and Everett, there is no such difference, but, on the contrary, if not an identity, yet a great similarity of principle, and many points of sympathy and attraction. They both stand between two extremes. There are no Abolitionists or disunionists to be found in the ranks of either; no Yanceys or Keitts or Sumners or Lovejoys among the National Democrats and the Bell Unionists. There are doubtless differences of opinion upon questions unconnected with slavery; but these are mostly questions of the past, and, if otherwise, they are unimportant, when compared with the great and urgent issues upon which the Union hangs. The only present point of difference, that can be regarded as material, relates to what is commonly called Squatter or Popular Sovereignty. But this is, after all, a legal, or judicial, and not a political question. Whether the people of an organized Territory have, or have not, any inherent authority independent of the will of Congress, is a question that the Judiciary only can determine. The political question is, not what powers, if any, the people of a Territory may exercise against the will or without the authority of Congress, but what powers they ought to be permitted to exercise, admitting the whole power to be in Congress; or, in other words, whether Congress ought to legislate for them, or permit them to legislate for themselves upon slavery, as well as all other domestic questions. Upon this question, the question of non-intervention, there is probably a very general concurrence between the National Democrats and the supporters of Mr. Bell. Non-intervention was the doctrine of Clay and Webster; it is the doctrine upon which the compromise measures of 1850 are founded; it is a doctrine to which the Whig party pledged itself in its last National Convention, and to which the American party pledged itself by the resolutions adopted by the Convention that nominated Fillmore and Donelson. We suppose there is hardly a single follower of Mr. Bell, either in the North or in the South, who is in favor of present intervention either for or against slavery, though there are doubtless many who maintain the constitution power to intervene. If the doctrine of non-intervention was not adopted by the National Union Convention, it was probably owing in great part to an aversion to the adoption of *any* platform, and partly perhaps to an unwillingness to shut out any really Union man, whether from the North or from the South, who, while not asking intervention, might be unwilling to abandon the claim, under circumstances that may possibly arise hereafter.

While, then, the Union men, or many of them, are separated from the National Democracy by the recollections of the past, they are drawn toward them by the sympathies of the present. We are alike, whether Unionists or National Democrats, attached to the Union, faithful to the Constitution, obedient to the laws, opposed to sectionalism in all its forms, and in favor of non-intervention upon the subject of slavery. And what serves to draw us yet closer together,

we are hated and reviled by all the abolitionists, nullifiers, disunionists, and sectional demagogues that afflict the land.

It was doubtless the perception of this fact that induced the Utica Convention to vest large discretionary powers in your Committee, with respect to the formation of an Electoral Ticket; and as well the language of the resolution conferring such powers, as the speeches of the members who supported it, and the unanimous and enthusiastic applause which those speeches drew forth, show that the Convention contemplated a union of the forces of the Unionists with the forces of the National Democrats — a UNION OF UNION MEN to put down sectionalism. Acting upon this understanding, and being met by the National Democrats in a like liberal and conciliatory spirit, we have placed upon our ticket, in conjunction with Electors who support our nominees, the names of a number of the supporters of Mr. Douglas; and the Democratic Convention having selected the same ticket, thus placing in nomination a number of the well-known supporters of Bell and Everett, we can now proclaim *that the friends of the Union in the Empire State are thoroughly and cordially united upon a single Electoral Ticket!*

We have endeavored to show, in the preceding remarks, that no principle forbids this union; the reasons of expediency that recommend it are very obvious.

We are not numerous enough to give the whole Electoral vote of the State to Bell and Everett. Whatever votes we may obtain by union are so many votes gained to our candidates. But this is not all they gain; every electoral vote given to Douglas also ensures to their benefit. In the present aspect of the contest, it is undeniable that Mr. Lincoln is the candidate who has the best chance of success, but by a sectional vote. If the vote of New York is taken from him his defeat is certain. Bell, Douglas and Lincoln will, in that case, probably be returned to the House, and Hamlin and Everett to the Senate. It is our firm belief that, in that event, John Bell — or if not John Bell, then, certainly, Edward Everett — will be President of the United States. We frankly declare that this is our first object, the end in which we aim, and to attain which we adopt what appear to us the most practical and effective means. But we declare, with the same frankness, that if, in this, our first wish, we shall be disappointed if Douglas, and not Bell, shall become President, we will welcome that result as greatly preferable to the success of sectional candidates.

It is said that this plan involves an election by the House of Representatives, and that that is a great evil. But if so, it is an evil for which we are no more responsible than the supporters of the other candidates. If we can prevent that evil by voting for Mr. Lincoln, the supporters of Mr. Lincoln have it equally in their power to prevent it by voting for Mr. Bell. Why should we, more than they, abandon the candidate of our choice? We do not seek to throw the election into the House, we seek to elect Bell and Everett by the people; but we congratulate ourselves upon the fact, that if unable to do so, we shall still probably succeed in the mode provided by the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution, when the people fail to make a choice.

But let us consider what is the evil, and wherein it consists, of an election of a President by the House of Representatives. In all human institutions, in all political action, a degree of evil is unavoidably mixed. It is an evil, and a thing to be regretted, that a majority of the people cannot agree that any one man shall be President. But what is the remedy for that evil? The remedy that the Constitution points out is, that the election in such case shall be devolved upon the House of Representatives, and that a majority of the States shall choose the President. The remedy that the Republicans propose is, that the voters shall vote, not according to their preference and judgment, but according to the apparent chances of success of one of the candidates; thus leaving a calculation of chances and not reason to determine the result. This would be to let a minority of the people choose a President obnoxious to the majority, in order to prevent a constitutional choice by the representatives of the people. We, on the

contrary, believe that the ballot ought to represent the opinion of the voter; that reason, and not fortune, should govern the popular choice; that the ballot box, and not the dice box, is the proper emblem of popular sovereignty.

But admitting the evils of an election of a President by the House of Representatives to be as great as is contended, they yet bear no comparison to the evils of an election of a President by a vote that is purely sectional, and against the sentiment of an immense majority of the people.

If Mr. Lincoln should be chosen President, allowing him to divide equally the Northern votes, which, with four candidates running, is more than he could do, there would still be against him the unbroken South, comprising not less than one million of voters, even after we have deducted the Germans of St. Louis and a few scattering voters, mainly of Northern origin, in the border States. A sectional President, elected by a *minority of one million of the people*, is an anomaly that our fathers never contemplated!

Yet this is not all. The Republican party is something more and worse than a mere sectional party. The principle upon which Mr. Lincoln was nominated is one that entirely excludes the great mass of the citizens of the Southern States from office. No one, upon the platform of that party, can be presented as a candidate for popular suffrage, unless he is wholly opposed to slavery. Our Union is, and always has been, a union of slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. In fifteen States of the Union, slavery exists by virtue of the fundamental law of those States. Any citizen of a slaveholding State, who upholds the constitutional feature of its institutions, is, by the Republican platform, ineligible to any office; certainly to any one that depends on popular suffrage, and according to the practice of parties, from any office whatever. Thus it appears that the Republican party is, substantially, an organization to exclude the citizens of the Southern States from all share in the government of our common country. This principle, and it is a fundamental principle, of the Republican party, a party that we are told is intended to be a permanent one, or at least to last as long as slavery lasts, is a palpable violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and it persisted in, must, in the event of the permanent success of that party, inevitably cause a dissolution of the Union.

It was never contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that the people of nearly half the States should be denied all voice in the government, and that a majority of the States should conspire together to use the patronage and power of the General Government to force a minority of the States to change their domestic institutions. The Republicans disavow all intention to interfere with Slavery in the States. It is a conspiracy through the forms of the Constitution to attain what the Constitution forbids.

Here then, alone, is a reason why, as we think, every good citizen ought to oppose the election of Lincoln and Hamlin, even though, in consequence of such opposition, a National President may be chosen in a constitutional manner. We say nothing now of other features of the Republican party, all tending to show the design of the leading spirits of that organization to overthrow slavery in the States, or, failing to do that, to overthrow the Union itself, — of the doctrine of the “irrepressible conflict,” — of the opposition to the Constitutional provision requiring the rendition of fugitive slaves, — of the harangues filled with hatred and fanaticism; uttered by Republican Senators and representatives in Congress, and circulated under the sanction of the Republican Central Committee at Washington; but laying all this aside, we are willing to rest the defense of our resistance to Republicanism and of our Union men to defeat it, upon the unanswerable argument derived from the very Constitution of the party, from the fundamental law to which it owes its being.

We must not forget, however, in opposing Northern sectionalism, to beware of running into the opposite extreme. In avoiding the Northern Scylla, let us take care not to fall into the Southern Charybdis. There are some Northern men who seem to think that the surest way to preserve the Union, is to grant

whatever Southern ultraists may demand. We are not of this class. Beside that, there are concessions and sacrifices unworthy of freemen, and which no political necessity can justify; such weak and timid policy is almost certain to defeat its object. Its effect in the South is to strengthen the enemies of the Union and to weaken its friends. But the recent elections in the South show a great reaction against the sectionalists in that region, and a return to old fraternal feelings. The latent love of union, startled by recent events, has burst forth there, we are rejoiced to see, with new and surprising force. And we have every reason to believe, especially after such demonstrations as we have been having in Kentucky and elsewhere, that sectionalism South is to be crushed out, as should be sectionalism in the North.

It is the common fate of those who, in the times of great political excitement, consulting the welfare of their country rather than the interests of party, endeavor to steer between extremes, to be assailed by opposing factions with even more violence than those factions assail each other. So it has fared with the Unionists of New York in the present crisis. A portion of the Republican presses and some of the orators whom they employ, not content with opposing our principles, have been engaged the last month in industrious efforts to asperse our motives and blacken our characters. The vagueness and absurdity of their charges, and the absence of all specifications, as well as the sources from which those charges proceed, are such as scarcely to permit even the brief and scornful denial, which is the only notice we can allow ourselves to take of them. The easy task of recrimination is forbidden, as well by the dignity of our cause as by the respect due to ourselves. Conscious of the rectitude of our motive, and entertaining no doubt of the justice and wisdom of our course, we are not to be disturbed by the railings of the foolish or the calumnies of the base. The men whom we are proud to claim as our associates and leaders in the great Union movement in this State, and in the North generally, are not inferior to any the country possesses, in the integrity of their character and the purity of their lives. They pursue noble ends by no other than honorable means. Most of them have for many years past abstained from all part in the politics of the country, and thus voluntarily excluded themselves from the rewards of ambition, because they could not conscientiously join either of the great political parties. They have been drawn from their retirement in the belief that there is now opened to them a way of honorable usefulness. With the blessings of Heaven, they intend to persevere in what they have undertaken, until there is no further need of their labors; until the banner of the Unionists is triumphant everywhere, and Secession, Abolition, and every form of disunion trodden under foot; until hatred, discord, and violence are banished, and peace, and harmony, and reverence for law, and fraternal love are recalled, restored, and reestablished among us, thenceforth and for evermore.

L. BURROWS, Albion.
DAVID RUSSELL, Salem.
A. M. BININGER, New York.
D. B. ST. JOHN, Newburgh.
A. K. CHANDLER, Fishkill.
A. H. PRESCOTT, Mohawk.
J. TENBROECK, Hudson.
C. B. FREEMAN, Fultonville.
ORVILLE PAGE, Canton.
D. O. SALMON, Syracuse.
ADDISON M. SMITH, Morris.
E. S. SWEET, Oswego.
SAMUEL HALLETT, Wayne.
J. P. FAUROTTE, Canandaigua.

SOL. G. HAVEN, Buffalo.
JAS. BROOKS, New York.
JONAS C. HEARTT, Troy.
GEO. BRIGGS, New York.
CHAS. D. EGAN, Brooklyn.
BENJ. R. SPELMAN, Albany.
WM. H. DAVIS, Schoharie.
J. J. MARLETT, Schenectady.
A. J. WILLIAMS, Utica.
JEHIAL READ, New York.
ALBERT PHILIPS, Ithaca.
JAS. L. ANGLE, Rochester.
M. F. ROBINSON, Batavia.
L. N. PLATT, Fredonia.

WILLIAM DUER, New York, Ch'n.

E. J. BROWN, New York, Sec'y.

REVIEW OF THE PRECEDING.

PRESUMING that the address here given is a fair exposition of the principles and platform of the party it advocates, it is now proposed to offer some remarks on those principles, as exhibited in this address. The chief object in this, is to correct some misapprehensions which seem to be entertained of the principles and intentions of the Republican party, as seen in this address, and to vindicate that party from some of the aspersions cast upon it.

The address commences with a very clear and true statement, that the great and sole question now dividing the Union, is that of slavery,—that is, its admission or rejection in the territories yet under the control of the Federal Government,—and it explains the respective positions of the four parties upon that question with fairness and accuracy; but, instead of showing that the ground on which the Bell-Everett party stands differs so much from the other three as to render its establishment necessary, it startles us with the declaration that between the “National Democracy,” as headed by Mr. Douglas, “and the Union party, that supports Bell and Everett,” there is no difference of purpose; “but, on the contrary, if not an identity, yet a great similarity of principle, and many points of sympathy and attraction.” It was supposed to be a calumny of Republican papers, that the two parties were about to form a coalition; and it was hardly to be expected that a party, led by some of the most honorable men in the nation, would—even before election—have exchanged the professed position of silence and non-committal on the great question contested, for the sake of harmony and the Union, for a junction with a party which proposes a settlement of that question by the legislatures of the territories,—a mode which is sure to be productive—as in Kansas—of the most embittered and disorganizing contest, and one the most menacing to the integrity of the Union.

The address next proceeds to advocate a doctrine it calls “non-intervention,” which, it says, is that of Webster, Clay, &c., and which is somewhat ambiguous. The only non-intervention that can be understood, which is really so, is that held by Mr. Breckinridge and his party, which denies the right of Congress, or any territorial power, to interfere with slave property in the territories; but this is plainly not the kind of non-intervention intended in the address; and if the determination of freedom or slavery is to be made by the legislatures or judiciaries of the territories, non-intervention by the Federal Government is abandoned, for the Governors of the territories, appointed by that Government, have a veto on all legislation, which is a direct intervention; and all questions of property, determined by the courts, is also an intervention of the Federal Government. Every one must see that it will depend upon the anti-slavery or pro-slavery sentiments of Congress and the President, whether legislation in the territories, for the suppression of slavery, will be permitted or not; and, it is equally obvious,

that where the people of a territory are on one side in sentiment, and the officials of the Federal Government on the other, a violent contest, such as that which occurred in Kansas, must be the consequence.

There is another word used in this address, which derives all its force from its vagueness; this is "sectionalism." It is repeated many times, and, in such a manner, as to imply that it signifies one of the most awful evils and wrongs that can be imagined; and, in this aspect, applied to Republicans, is a gross misrepresentation of their sentiments. The Republican party does not seek to gain any political advantage or power to the Northern or Free States, by the injury, or at the expense, of the Southern or Slave States: on the contrary, though generally believing slavery to be an evil and a crime, and feeling the disgrace which attaches to them by their connection with it, they invariably and sincerely disclaim any desire or intention of interfering with it, politically, in the States where it exists; any movement for that purpose would be condemned and resisted by them as vigorously as by the "Union" men. It is true they oppose the extension of slavery beyond those States; but this is not in hostility to them, as these Slave States would not be benefited by such extension; but to avert an evil from regions not yet exclusively claimed by either section, and for whose rights and prosperity they are in part responsible. With no propriety can this be called sectional.

The whole object of the Republican party is the prevention of slavery in the territories, and its prevalence wherever the Federal Government has sway. In this, they are acting strictly on the defensive; for if they consent to its introduction into those regions, they acknowledge the right of holding property in man; and, if they make this acknowledgment, they cannot resist the claim of slaveholders to settle with their slaves in any of the Free States, as those States have no power to exclude property; and, judging by the past, of the subserviency of government officials and judicial benches, there can be no doubt that protection to such "property" would every where be enforced, with all the unprincipled severity applied to the Fugitive Slave Law; and consequently, this barbarous, depraving, and desolating institution would be extended over our whole land. There is no mode of preventing this criminal evil, except by denying the right of property in man, and resisting its admission as such wherever we have the power. The northern part of the Union does not propose to enforce its view of the wrong of slavery on the States of the South, but to leave it to themselves; but the slaveholders of the South *do* insist upon compelling the North to receive their claim of the right of slavery, and to legislate accordingly. Which of these courses of action is the sectional one?

We now meet in this address with an extraordinary chain of sophistries. It is said:—"We frankly declare that this (the election of Bell or Everett by the H. of R.) is our first object,—the end at which we aim,—and to attain which we adopt what appears to us the most practical and effective means; but we declare, with the same frankness, that if in this, our first wish, we shall be disappointed,—if Douglas and not Bell shall become President,—we will welcome that result as greatly preferable to the success of sectional candidates." Now, when the signers of this address must know that their party is the smallest of the four

in the House of Representatives, and that if the election goes to the Senate, Lane would most certainly be elected, the declaration that they aim first to elect Bell, and only, in case of failure, to admit Douglas, must be regarded as insincere. The only real aim is to defeat Lincoln, whoever else may be President. The declaration then made does not accord with a true idea of "frankness."

Next it is said : — " If we can prevent that evil (the election by the H. of R.) by voting for Mr. Lincoln, the supporters of Mr. Lincoln have it equally in their power to prevent it by voting for Mr. Bell." That is, if a small party may prevent a congressional election, by joining one ten times as large, for an object in which there is not pretended to be any moral wrong, the largest party in the Union may do so, by giving up the whole of their righteous principle, and virtually voting for the extension and support of an institution which they believe to be subversive of the rights of man and the laws of God, — an equal alternative truly ! Who does not see that the question is not merely between one policy and another, but between an asserted positive right and an asserted positive wrong ?

Admitting the evil of non-election by a majority of the people, the address goes on to say : — " The remedy that the Republicans propose is, that the voters shall vote, not according to their preference and judgment, but according to the apparent success of one of the candidates, — thus leaving a calculation of chances, and not reason, to determine the result." If this is to be understood literally, there is not the slightest ground for such a misrepresentation. If Republicans were thus indifferent to the character or politics of their candidate, and only regarded his availability, they would of course drop Lincoln, and vote for the candidate of the greatest of the other parties, as, by this junction, they could be sure to elect him. If, as is probable, it is only meant here that Republicans select a candidate from their own party, who, with sufficient qualifications, is likely to obtain most electoral votes, do not all parties necessarily do the same ? Were not Bell and Everett selected among all other eminent Union men for the same reason ? If all the voters, obeying the address, should vote " according to their preference and judgment," — if the ballot should always " represent the opinion of the voter," — there certainly could be no election by the people, — indeed nobody could get an electoral vote of any State. To let a minority of the people " choose a President obnoxious to the majority," must be the case with any candidate, when there cannot be found for him a majority of electoral votes, and certainly would be the case if Bell, Douglas, or Breckinridge should be chosen by the House of Representatives.

But we are told : — " The Republican party is something more and worse than a mere sectional party. The principle upon which Mr. Lincoln was nominated, is one that entirely excludes the great mass of the citizens of the Southern States from office. No one upon the platform of that party can be presented as a candidate for popular suffrage, unless he is wholly opposed to slavery." What principle this is, in the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, which thus excludes Southern citizens from office, we are not informed. It is true the Republican party will not present a candidate for suffrage who is not opposed to slavery, for this is their ground ; but neither will either of the other three parties propose a can-

didate who is opposed to slavery. It is to be presumed that the citizens of every State or District in the Union will vote for persons who are in sympathy with their own views on slavery, whether Mr. Lincoln is President or not; and, as to Executive appointments by him, that they should be all from Northern States, or from anti-slavery men, is a measure disavowed by him, and his well-known character forbids a distrust of his sincerity; nor would such a course be approved by any honorable man of his party. But, on the other hand, this has been the invariable practice in the later years of the Democratic domination: no man could obtain the most trifling office who is not a decided pro-slavery man; and if either of the candidates opposed to Lincoln should be elected, this policy would necessarily be continued. It may be that Bell, if elected, would sincerely and earnestly desire to dispense his offices with an impartial hand; but the overwhelming influence of the slave power, which he could not resist, would compel him to a different course.

What is meant by the remark that "A majority of the States should conspire together to use the patronage and power of the General Government to force a minority of the States to change their domestic institutions?" If this alleged "conspiracy" is attributed to the Republican party, it is a calumnious intimation, for which there is not the slightest ground. The power and patronage of the General Government has been used to force upon a majority of the Free States this "domestic institution," which they abhor; and if either of the three pro-slavery candidates are elected, it may reasonably be expected that such a "conspiracy" will be renewed.

The chain of sophistries in this address now seems to wind up with the declaration, that the main object of the C. U. party is to defeat the election of the Republican candidate, partly in fear of the imaginary bugbears predicted as the consequences of such election; but, more than all, on account of its objectionable "constitution," "the fundamental law to which it owes its being." Now, "the fundamental law" to which the Republican party "owes its being," is, that it is the right and duty of Congress to prevent the establishment of slavery in the territories under their government; as neither the constitution, nor the Free States, recognize the right of property in man; and to place the whole action of the Government, as far as it has power, on the side of freedom; and this is the whole basis of the party, nothing more nor less. In objecting, therefore, to this "fundamental law," the C. U. party conversely maintains that slaveholders have a right to hold their slaves, as such, in the territories, if permitted by their local laws; and this necessarily implies the right of property in man. We are thus brought to the radical question, on which the C. U. party are called on to show their hands. Do they, or do they not, admit the right of holding their fellow men as property? Let us no longer be mystified by popular generalities, about harmony of the States, by imaginary fears for the safety of the Union, or false interpretations of the constitution; but if the Union party really take the position, that it is right that men of one color should reduce their fellow men of another color, who are equally children of God with themselves, to merchandize, — to shut them out from the light of the gospel and of education; prohibit their marriages; separate their families; sell them, like horses, at

auction; to overwork and scourge them, as they would brutes,—then let this be acknowledged openly, and let it be known to the christian, moral, and humane citizens of the Free States; but if, in the light of the justice they profess, they disclaim approbation of this atrocious crime, in consistency they should cease their opposition to the Republican party, which is the only efficient political movement against its indefinite extension.

There is a gleam of liberality and good sense in the next paragraph, which reproves the opinion of some “Northern men, who seem to think that the surest way to preserve the Union, is to grant whatever Southern ultraists may demand;” yet this course, though highly reprehensible, is the only consistent one for those who aim only at peace. The notion that there can be an intermediate moderate conduct, which shall cease to resist the encroachments of the slave power, and yet make no “concessions and sacrifices unworthy of freemen, which no necessity can justify,” is an illusion: past events and present tempers show that unless such concessions and sacrifices are made, the slave power will not be satisfied, and the “irrepressible conflict” must continue. Slaveholders contend for a principle which would establish slavery wherever they desire to extend it, in violation of the rights, the interests, and the holiest feelings of surrounding freemen. As to the hope of pacification derived from the perception of the rising anti-slavery sentiment in the Slave States, it is doubtless cheering; but is it not plain that the developments of these smothered embers of freedom, derive all their encouragement from the advance of the Republican party? Let this party be dissolved, or lower its radical principle, and every spark of anti-slavery fire in the South would vanish!

It is unnecessary to comment on the closing paragraph of this address, which complains of the aspersions and false charges against the C. U. party, and its members, by Republican presses, the only ones for whom it has made such a complaint. Such censures, wrong as we admit them to be, always appear in times preceding any great contested election, as no party can control the indiscretions and illiberalities of all its speakers and editors. It is believed that the Republican party is as little culpable in this respect as any that has existed.

The arguments in the Address in favor of the C. U. party being examined, a few words may be added on the practical effect of its success. It is almost certain that none of the four candidates for the presidency now in the field, but Mr. Lincoln, can be elected by the electoral colleges. If the election goes to the H. of R., it is not probable that the representatives of the States opposed to him, whatever may be their animosities, will be so foolish as to lose the whole election in the “House,” by each standing up for his own candidate, which would only result in the choice of Mr. Lane by the Senate. They will, therefore, unite on some one of the candidates; and as Mr. Breckinridge, next after Mr. Lincoln, will have the greatest number of votes, the majority will be given to either of them. The defeat, therefore, of Mr. Lincoln, both by the colleges and the H. of R., for which the C. U. party strives, will result in the election of Mr. Breckinridge. It is the only possible alternative in the present election.

The election of Mr. Breckinridge to the presidential chair, and the consequent prevalence of his doctrine in the Federal Government, leads to the

permission of slavery in the territories, as rightful property, and the judicial protection of it, as such, in disregard of any law, congressional or territorial, to the contrary ; as no law, depriving individuals of property, would be constitutional ; and by logical consequence, under that view, slaves might be held in all the now Free States, where the right of property is equally sacred. This instead of a moderate position, is extreme pro-slavery ground.

But it is probable that such an advance of slavery would be resisted, not only by Republicans, but by all the lovers of freedom in the country ; and yet, being maintained by governmental power and slaveholding interest, the " irrepressible conflict " must be interminable, or only to be closed by the entire destruction of liberty or slavery in the Union, or its dissolution. Thus it appears that the defeat of the election of Mr. Lincoln, — the avowed aim of the C. U. party, — would tend ultimately to produce the entire prevalence of slavery, with all its horrors, over the Union ; the continuance of the embittered contest between the States ; or the separation of the North from the South ; either of which is directly opposed to the objects professed by the C. U. party. As the Republican party does not intend any infringement of the constitutional rights of the South, and as no sensible man believes in the threats of secession, in case of the election of Lincoln, that election is the only event that can bring harmony, with the continuance of the Union, and justice to all the States.



